

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Site Visit
Community & Economic Development Department Lobby
102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, March 18, 2014 - 3:00 p.m.

1. Verification of Notice

Chair Losoff verified the site visit had been properly noticed.

2. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Losoff called the site visit to order at 3:03 p.m.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff and Commissioners Eric Brandt, John Currivan, Scott Jablow, Kathy Levin and Norm Taylor. Vice Chair Michael Hadley was excused.

Staff Present: Cari Meyer and David Peck

3. The Commission and Staff will then carpool to the site of the proposed Tlaquepaque North project at 301-321 State Route 179.

The Commission and staff left City Hall at approximately 3:04 p.m. and met at the proposed Tlaquepaque North site at approximately 3:20 p.m.

4. Discussion on a site inspection of 301-321 State Route 179 (across from the existing Tlaquepaque Village) regarding a request for Conceptual Development Review for a proposed redevelopment of the site. The subject property is zoned C-1 (General Commercial), is approximately 1.065 acres, and is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 401-18-030L, M, & N. Project Number PZ14-00001; Applicant: Tlaquepaque Partners, LLC

Mike Bower with Design Group Architects; Wendy Lippman, Managing Partner for Tlaquepaque, and Max Bacon, working with the Design Group Architects, joined the Commission at the site. Mike Bower then pointed out the house that would be remodeled into a more barn-like structure with the second level removed, and clad in a stone veneer close to the pump house. The historic pump house is behind the house. The rest of the buildings will be like Tlaquepaque, but the remodeled house will have an historic feel.

Commission's Questions/Comments:

- Question as to if any of the buildings will be higher than they are now. Mike Bower indicated probably not.
- Question as to whether or not they will be asking for a height variance. Mike Bower indicated yes, the site is in the floodplain, so there is a required base floor elevation, and all of the buildings have to be at that level, plus there will be some fill for a driveway by the large Juniper tree. Max Bacon added that the ridge height is 20 ft. 9 in. off of grade.
- Question about the trees staying in place. Mike Bower indicated yes, the site plan saves all of the trees except for the last one on the right.
- Question about requesting a variance on the parking to save a tree. Mike Bower indicated yes and pointed out the tree.
- Question about a wall along the property line. Mike Bower pointed out the existing wall, which isn't owned by Tlaquepaque. Wendy Lippman indicated they have a good relationship with that owner, and perhaps they can all work on how to make the wall have a little more appeal. If

there is ever an opportunity, the design of this project could enable them to easily incorporate that area.

- Question about opening up a walkway for people to go through. Mike Bower indicated that is a good idea, and Max Bacon pointed out the low spot on Tlaquepaque's property, so they are sloping down.
- Question about who owns the wall. Wendy Lippman indicated they have worked 50-50 on it and Tlaquepaque repaired the whole wall. It would require an Alta survey to determine that.
- Question about whether or not the operators of the Center for the New Age own the building. Wendy indicated that they are all tenants; it is owned by the Woo family partnership in Phoenix.
- Question about shared parking on the site. Mike Bower indicated there is none now.
- Question about having employees of the new complex park in the other employee lot. Wendy Lippman indicated that is correct. Mike Bower indicated that they still end up 14 spaces shy of the formula, and Tlaquepaque has a surplus, so Wendy can force employees to park there.

Mike Bower pointed out the story pole placed for height and the spray paint on the ground to indicate the corners. Max Bacon indicated the front corner of Building A closest to the Hideaway. Max also pointed out the building where the air conditioners could be seen from the hill.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about the height being as high as the pole. Mike Bower clarified that it is as high as the black paint; the code would really let it go 2 ft. higher. The pole is at 20 ft. 6 in., but the black is what the code requires the first 15 ft. to be, to create the step-back along all roadways. They are asking for consideration to not require that, because they have the large trees. Also, Tlaquepaque has a lot of variation, so it might be too much if the front had to be low with the back high, and from above, you are looking onto the roof of a 15 ft. high building, so it might be more eye level if we go a little higher, which would improve the visual experience.

Max Bacon and Mike Bower pointed out the front corners of Building B and indicated that the driveway is at the high point of the lot. It is a moderate grading all the way through. Max indicated that the driveway will come through where the ADOT rail is and ADOT is tentatively okay with it.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Comment that they are not going to be able to drive all the way across S.R. 179; they will have to turn right. Cari Meyer indicated that all of the driveways are right-in and right-out.
- Question about a deceleration lane on S.R. 179. Wendy Lippman referenced the severity of the tree removal and Max agreed all of the trees would have to be removed. Wendy indicated that she was in favor of doing a pedestrian crosswalk up above, but after the analysis of the ingress, egress and turn lanes, according to ADOT it is not safe, so they are back to that one crosswalk, unless there is another idea.

Mike Bower pointed out another story pole with the black paint at 15 ft., and explained that from the road, you see the other buildings behind even the high point of 20 ft., so there isn't an issue of blocking a view. They want to do something that is right for massing, and it didn't feel right to chop the whole front half down, and then pop the back half up.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about covering up the pump house. Mike Bower confirmed it will be in front of the pumphouse.
- Question about whether or not the property line is forest land. Mike Bower indicated no, it is all private property on the other side.

Max Bacon indicated they were going to try to work a rock motif from the pumphouse into Tlaquepaque, so there might be some stone mixed in on some of the newer buildings. Mike Bower then indicated the access that would be closed off.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about plans to do something with the wall. Mike Bower explained that is off of their property and Wendy Lippman indicated that the Owenby Ditch will remain and it will be worked into the design.
- Question about the location of the road. Wendy Lippman pointed out the marks for ingress and the location of the exit. They won't have the grooves that tear up tires, but if you haven't been here, you can easily drive by the first entry, so they are going to encourage a flow, so if they come out and the parking is full, they can get into the Portal Lane lot.
- Concern expressed about people exiting and trying to make the far left turn, cutting across traffic, so if there is any way to block it, so they can't do that. Wendy indicated she thought there would be something they can do.
- Question about any new shrubbery being placed out by the roadway. Wendy explained that it is all ADOT right-of-way.
- Comment that there has to be a sight line for the exit.

Cari Meyer pointed out the Verde Lynx stops as the Commission walked to the crosswalk area.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about having a new bus shelter located there, to get more people. Wendy indicated they could work on that, but asked what that entails and would it go in the right-of-way. If you are getting a Right-of-Way Permit, you would just include it. You would work with Victor Estrada in our Streets Department would work with ADOT on that. Wendy indicated that she didn't have a problem with that.
- Question about the APS boxes. Wendy indicated that it is several hundred thousand dollars to put them underground.
- Question as to whether or not any shrubbery could mask it. Wendy indicated that she has asked about a gate or something ornamental, but APS has to have access.

While looking at the crosswalk, Mike Bower explained to the Commission that the Pedestrian Study concluded that they can't make any other crosswalks safely. They are going to explore what they can do to make the one crosswalk more used and enhanced. At each Tlaquepaque access points, they can do some internal onsite signage to indicate the direction of the pedestrian crossing to channel the internal traffic to it. There is no crosswalk painted on Portal Lane, but there is a new sidewalk and people tend to want to jaywalk there and cross S.R. 179 at Portal Lane, and by painting a crosswalk on Portal Lane, it would help slow people this way. In addition to landscaping, some kind of element to say pedestrian in the middle might be worth considering, because now you have no clue that there is a crosswalk here.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Concern expressed about the traffic in Uptown and pedestrians holding up traffic, which could be a major factor here. Cari Meyer pointed out that the Pedestrian Study showed that by concentrating people here, it will minimize that.
- Comment that regardless of where they are, having more people is going to back traffic up.
- Comment that the Pedestrian Study seemed to show when the greatest amount of people were crossing, and it was like from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., so if you look at the blocks, you could anticipate that the queuing with a tripling of pedestrians . . .
- Comment that you are also going to have 40 more cars in here.
- Question about having an underpass. Mike Bower indicated they had talked about it, and it kind of already exists for them, if you go to the Sycamores and walk down the bank to the creek; you can walk right underneath the road. The problem is that at the time they were doing that, there was discussion about trying to make that beautiful, but they didn't, so it is bad news. If the other property was in play, then the underpass could have a meaning for Tlaquepaque, but now it doesn't.

- Question about talking to the neighboring owner. Wendy indicated that one thing that came out of the study was the potential of having an alert beacon light when someone enters the crosswalk.

David Peck indicated that it is not like this area is all undeveloped and will now be developed, so whether there will be a huge increase in pedestrian traffic really isn't known. The report will probably show the difference between now and what it will be with possibility a restaurant here.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Comment that the report cited about 40% one way and 10% the other way.
- Comment that the report also stated that the increase would be about 300% over what it is now, and if that is a given, it is something we have to look at.
- Comment that in the meeting, there will be three questions. One is an underpass, the second would be an overpass, and the third is a traffic light like the one in the middle of Uptown, because without a light, you may have continuous pedestrian traffic.
- Suggestion to encourage everyone to talk with the owners of the other properties about participating in building a nice area.
- Question as to if anyone has talked to the owner of the Creekside property. Wendy Lippman indicated no; she wanted to meet with the Commission first.
- Question about signage. Mike Bower indicated they don't know yet, but they want the signage to mirror Tlaquepaque, and they will probably reduce signage from what is there today.
- Comment expressing appreciation that the trees aren't being taken down.
- Question about a wall, since part of the look of Tlaquepaque is the wall. Mike Bower indicated they explored it and have realized that they don't need a continuous wall, since the parking isn't right there. They will have some wall and there is a pedestrian gateway between Buildings A and B, with some sense of an arch.
- Question as to if there would be any benefit to seeing what the creek access would look like if the possibility of an underpass was explored. Mike Bower and Wendy Lippman indicated yes; the area underneath the bridge is key.

The Commission and applicant proceeded to the bridge, and Mike Bower explained that around the corner, you are not on a bridge; you are under the roundabout, which is a hideous environment. The walk itself could be a beautiful experience. The pedestrian bridge is open and you can walk under it, and it is great until you get that corner. The walk is really the first step to making a walkable district more walkable, but it would bring up the concerns of those who say that no people should get close to the creek. Wendy Lippman explained that her concern is that it is quite a project to undertake, and Mike Bower added that there are also flood issues, etc.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Comment that there are no shops, etc., to draw people there.
- Comment that the ramp could be gentle stairs that go down to the creek in the right-of-way.

5. The Commission and Staff will then carpool to the site of the proposed Sedona Rouge Expansion.

The Commission and staff left the Tlaquepaque North site at approximately 3:55 p.m. and met at the proposed Sedona Rouge expansion site at approximately 4:15 p.m.

6. Discussion on a site inspection 95 Goodrow Lane (behind the existing Sedona Rouge Hotel) regarding a request for expansion of the existing hotel to include an additional 32 units, realignment of Goodrow Lane, and other site improvements including landscaping and parking. The subject property is zoned L (Lodging), is approximately 1.486 acres, and is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 408-24-071B. Project Number: PZ13-00013; Applicant: Sedona Rouge, LLC

Ed Conway, with Sedona Rouge; Al Walburg, developer and owner of Sedona Rouge; Erik Peterson and Adam Valente with PHX Architecture, and Roland Fontaine, Asset Manager for the owners of the hotel, joined the Commission at the site.

Al Walburg indicated that they poled the South Building, and they also have a building that goes next to Goodrow. Erik Peterson explained that it is L-shaped and pointed out the event lawn area. All of the rooms focus on Thunder Mountain, plus there is the new access road across the back at a higher elevation with a retaining wall.

Commission's Questions/Comments:

- Question about people looking over another building. Erik explained they would look over the side of the building, but the distance is enough that they can see both ways.
- Question as to whether or not the poles are the façade height and not the ridge height. It was indicated they are probably the eave height. Al Walburg added that the poles show the front height or south side height and width. Then, he explained the depth.
- Question about people seeing the back side of the building. Al Walburg indicated they checked that today, and the second floor rooms will lose their view, but the third floor rooms will still have a good view of the red rocks.
- Question about using a couple of those for affordable housing. Al indicated those are already in place; they went in to perfect the 2009 entitlements for the 32 rooms.

The Commission then proceeded to the other corner and Al Walburg indicated that they tried to use the natural site topography. Erik Peterson explained the new entry point to the area from the lobby and indicated that the current registration lobby area will be retained. Al Walburg then discussed the parking arrangement.

Al indicated that the one corner of the east building was staked, plus that the road is going to be improved and widened to 20 ft. Al also pointed out where the parking would start and indicated that although the road was narrow, the right-of-way was 50 ft. wide.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about people being able to exit to S.R. 89A. Cari Meyer explained that it would still be a public street up to a point, and then it would become Sedona Rouge property.
- Question about shielding the fence, and it was explained that it would be landscaped.
- Question about having a gate at the access to the parking lot, so only guests can go through. Al Walburg explained that there will be a gate at the top; they won't have a problem with the residents going their old way. They can still go through the parking lot, but when they leave, the gate won't open for them, so they will go over to Rodeo. Question about two or three residents down below, and it was explained that they will go the way they always have, except they will have an improved road. There is also the option of going out the new road to Rodeo or going out through their parking lot. They are receiving about a 65 ft. right-of-way, and there is a marker for the new road.
- Question regarding trees being removed, and the indication that they are going to try to keep as many as they can for parking lot islands, but there is some grading needed.
- Question regarding the speed limit on the new road and how the neighbors feel about traffic under their home. Cari explained that staff has some comments from the neighbor that will be discussed at the meeting, and it was noted that the speed limit would be 25 mph.
- Question regarding the decibels allowed in the Sound Code. Cari indicated it was 60 decibels at night and 65 decibels during the day.
- Comment that some grading would be needed to make the road level. Al Walburg noted that there will be a 5 ft. retaining wall, and Cari explained that the wall could go up to 8 ft.

Al Walburg indicated that in the area between the rooms, utilities will be undergrounded and there is a gas line that will require an easement to the gas company. Al then identified the location of the event lawn area and noted that they will be taking down the current wedding garden.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about the location of the stage. It was noted that it would be a backdrop in the event lawn area.

Erik Peterson explained that there will be a retaining wall and it drops down 6 ft., so any noise would be blocked. Al then identified the location of the podium and retaining wall, so people won't see it; they would just see part of the wall. Cari pointed out the location of the house and indicated that it is all one property, and Al indicated that the next house is the next lot up, so it is far away.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about their intention to have a band at times. Al Walburg indicated he thinks they will have a harpist and a violin.
- Question about the backdrop for the stage and Al explained it would be the retaining wall. Erik indicated that it would be about the same as it is now, and it was clarified that it isn't really a stage, but more of a flagstone area.
- Question about if they will do more weddings, and it was indicated that about 90% will be weddings plus a few lunches. Last year they had 18 weddings and they anticipate 25 this year.
- Question about a corporation wanting to have an event outside of the renters. Al Walburg indicated that they aren't going to allow outside people to just come in. Basically, they want to rent rooms. It was also explained that the normal wedding size is 50 to 80 people.
- Comment that the parking isn't adequate for outside events. Cari indicated that was discussed with the applicant, so it can be discussed later.
- Request to see the exit for the new road.

Al Walburg discussed the sidewalk that will go to just north of the Safeway driveway. Cari then pointed out the location where the new road will exit.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Question about traffic counts. Cari indicated that they did a study of the intersection.

Al Walburg then discussed the location of a switch-back crosswalk to Safeway, which forces people to face the traffic. David Peck explained that the idea is to have people face the on-coming traffic.

Commission's Questions/Comments (continued):

- Concern about the crosswalk design confusing people. David Peck indicated that they will be looking at that; people going to Safeway may not take that jog. Erik described a crossing in Scottsdale on a 6-lane road in two directions with 50 mph traffic, but noted that here you might skip the crosswalk altogether.
- Question about the purpose of the bricks. A Commissioner indicated that they are traffic calming, so people pay attention. Additionally, the Commission was told that a neighbor's request was to make the center lane turn left as well.
- Comment that traffic already gets stacked at the southernmost exit.

7. Adjournment and return by carpool to City Hall.

At the Tlaquepaque North site, Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 4:46 p.m. without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the site visit of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on March 18, 2014.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date